

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/812,861	Applicant(s) VAN STEENKISTE ET AL.	
	Examiner Katherine A. Bareford	Art Unit 1762	

All Participants:

(1) Katherine A. Bareford.

(2) David LaPrairie.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 March 2006 **Time:** _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-9, 11, 12, 23, 27

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On March 13, 2006, the Examiner suggested an Examiner's Amendment to Mr. LaPrairie where claims 1-9, 11, 12, 23 and 27 would be canceled, and the features of claim 27 as to the size of the particles would be written into independent claim 12, providing at line 4 that the size range changed from "250-1400" to "600 to 1400". However, on March 14, 2006, by voice mail, Mr. LaPrairie indicated that he could not accept this proposal..